DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 927 PS 015 561

AUTHOR Arroyo, Aline A.; Sugawara, Alan I.
TITLE A Scale of Student Teaching Concerns for Use with Early Childhood Education Teacher Trainees.
PUB DATE [83]
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Competence; Early Childhood Education; *Factor Structure; Higher Education; Questionnaires; *Student Teachers; Teacher Education; Teacher Effectiveness; *Test Reliability; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Scale of Student Teacher Concerns

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to devise a valid and reliable scale to assess the teaching concerns of early childhood students at various levels in their teacher training experiences. A total of 167 concerns, generated by 104 teacher trainees, their trainers, and an extensive review of the literature, were classified according to Katz's (1972) paradigm of teacher development. These concerns were randomly organized in a Scale of Student Teaching Concerns (SSTC) and administered to 107 teacher trainees prior to their involvement in training practicums at seven similar early childhood programs in Montana, Utah, and Oregon. The trainees rated each concern using a 5-point Likert-type scale on the dimension of perceived importance. In addition, the teacher competency of trainees was assessed using the Preschool Teacher Competency Rating Scale approximately 3 to 4 weeks into their training practicums. Findings indicated the existence of four factors, including survival, consolidation, renewal, and maturity, as suggested by Katz (1972). In addition, the final version of the SSTC successfully discriminated between beginning and advanced level teacher trainees, providing some construct validity for the scale. Reliability estimates, including two internal consistency estimates, revealed concerns associated with each of the four factors in the final SSTC to be relatively homogeneous. An exploratory study regarding the relationships between teaching concerns and teacher competency revealed no significant relationships between these variables. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED265927

A Scale of Student Teaching Concerns for use With Early Childhood Education Teacher Trainees

Aline A. Arroyo and Alan I. Sugawara

Human Development and Family Studies

Oregon State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Aline A. Arroyo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 015561

Running Head: Student Teaching Concerns for Early Childhood Trainees

First Author's Address: Department of Education
P.O. Box DE
Agana, Guam 96910

Abstract

Effective teacher training programs have been a concern for many years. While most teacher training programs have been evaluated by follow-up studies valuable information can be gained by assessing the needs and concerns of teacher trainees as they progress through their teacher training experiences. The primary purpose of this study was to develop a Scale of Student Teaching Concerns (SSTC) to assess the concerns of early childhood teachers in training.

One-hundred-sixty-seven concerns, generated by 104 teacher trainees, their trainers, and an extensive review of the literature, were classified according to Katz's (1972) paradigm of teacher development. These concerns were randomly organized in a questionnaire and administered to 107 teacher trainees prior to their involvement in their training practicums at seven similar early childhood programs in Montana, Utah, and Oregon. The trainees rated each concern using a 5-point Likert-type scale from extremely important to extremely unimportant. In addition, the teacher competency of trainees was assessed using the Preschool Teacher Competency Rating Scale (PTCRS) approximately three to four weeks into their training practicums.

Following teaching concerns weed-out, the remaining concerns were factor analyzed using a principal components solution and varimax rotation. Results revealed the existence of four factors including Survival, Consolidation, Renewal, and Maturity as suggested by Katz (1972). In addition, multivariate analysis of subjects' scores on the four factors revealed the final SSTC to successfully discriminate between beginning (n=53) and advanced (n=54) level teacher trainees, providing some construct validity for the scale. Furthermore, reliability estimates, including two internal consistency estimates (e.g., item-total score correlations and Chronbach alpha) revealed concerns associated with each of the four factors in the final SSTC to be relatively homogeneous. An exploratory study regarding the relationships between teaching concerns and teacher competency revealed no significant relationships between these variables.

A Scale of Student Teaching Concerns for use with Early Childhood Education Teacher Trainees

During the past five years, the quality of teachers in public schools has come under great scrutiny (Newsweek, 1981; Phi Delta Kappan, 1980; Time, 1980). In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education published a report entitled A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education. In that publication, the commission concluded that the educational foundations of society were being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity in the schools which treated the future of the nation and its people (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

One of the significant factors that is crucial to the success of an educational system is the teacher training programs, where teacher skills and competencies are developed. Are teacher training programs actually meeting the needs of teachers? Do teachers feel well-prepared to teach children upon graduation? Several studies have shown that a majority of teachers, particularly first year teachers, feel their educational preparation as teachers was good, positive or satisfactory (Queen & Gretes, 1982; Ryan, Applegate, Flora, Johnston, Lasley, Mager & Newman, 1979). However, at the same time, these teachers retrospectively wished they had more field experiences, preparation for work with children having special needs, and survival skills such as record keeping, conferencing with parents, managing a classroom, and promoting more positive relationships with supervisors (Greener & Thurlow, 1982; Elliot & Steinkellner, 1979;

Queen & Gretes, 1982).

Perhaps the crucial time to become aware of these teaching concerns is during the teacher training process. Research has pointed out that student teachers experience different needs and concerns during various phases of their teacher training experiences (Burden, 1980; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Watts, 1980). To date, though, the writings of Lillian Katz (1972) are by far the most detailed in outlining the stages through which an individual progresses in becoming a teacher. Most of her ideas have not yet been verified through empirical research. However, due to her extensive work with teachers in training over the years, her ideas appear to contain a certain "common sense" validity to them.

According to Katz (1972), the preoccupation with "survival" concerns marks the first stage of teacher development, which lasts for approximately the first full year of a student's training experience. During this stage, student teachers are filled with anxieties, wondering whether or not they can make it through the day with a group of young children. They are unsure about what will really happen to them in the classroom and why it happens. Questions such as "What are young children like?", "What can I expect of them?", and "Can I really do this day after day?" become paramount. Katz (1972) suggests that during this period, student teachers need support, understanding, encouragement, reassurance, comfort, and guidance in their training experiences. Therefore, guidance and support from onsite trainers who are readily and consistently available become

important during this time.

Upon realizing that they can survive, perhaps by the end of the first year, student teachers now move into what is described as the "consolidation" stage of teacher development. During this time, student teachers begin to focus on individual problem children and situations they encounter during their teacher training experiences. Katz (1972) suggests that after establishing a basic knowledge about children and what to expect, the concerns of student teachers shift toward dealing with "specific behavior patterns that stray from the norm." Questions such as "How can I help a clinging child?" and "How can I help a particular child who does not seem to be learning?" become important. Therefore, onsite guidance from trainers who focus on helping student teachers interpret various problem behaviors, situations and their solutions become significant.

Around the third or fourth year of the training experience, Katz (1972) suggests that student teachers move into the "renewal" stage. Boredom with the same old routines begins to set in and student teachers search for newer materials, techniques, and approaches for use in their teaching. During this stage student teachers look for "refreshing ideas" and are particularly receptive to experiences gained through regional and national conferences and workshops. Participation in professional associations as members and attendance at their meetings become meaningful. Student teachers are now interested in what other teachers and professionals are doing in the field.

Finally, during the last stage of teacher development, identified as the "maturity" stage, student teachers begin to ask deeper and more abstract questions about the teaching profession. During this time, personal insight and perspectives are sought. Questions such as "How are educational decisions made?" and "What are my historical and philosophical roots?" become important. Student teachers are no longer preoccupied with practical skills, but become more philosophical in examining their ideals and values. These student teacher now welcome the chance to read widely and to interact with educators working on a variety of problem areas related to teaching at many different levels.

According to Katz (1972), the amount of time a student teacher spends within each stage varies among individuals. "Maturity" may be reached by some within three years, but by others in five or more years.

The primary purpose of this study was to devise a valid and reliable scale to assess the teaching concerns of early childhood students, based on Katz's (1972) theoretical ideas, at various levels in their teacher training experiences. More specifically, this study focused on developing "A Scale of Student Teaching Concerns" for use with student teachers in an early childhood teacher training program. Such a scale can provide a beginning point for the development of early childhood teacher training programs based in part on the needs and concerns of students in training.

Method

Development of the SSTC[1]

Conceptual Framework. The Scale of Student Teaching Concerns (SSTC), ~~developed for~~ this ~~study~~, was used to assess the teaching concerns of subjects. This scale consists of 55 statements depicting the four areas of concerns previously described by Katz (1972). The first area, Survival, consists of 14 statements. The second and third areas, Consolidation and Renewal, consists of 16 statements each. The fourth area, Maturity, consists of 9 statements. The four areas of teaching concerns are described and illustrated in the following paragraphs.

1. Survival Concerns - refers to the degree to which a student teacher is concerned about being able to endure being a teacher (e.g., Can I make it through the day? Can I really do this day after day?)
2. Consolidation Concerns - refers to the degree to which a student teacher is concerned with the knowledge and skills necessary to be an effective teacher (e.g., How can I help a clinging child? How can I help a particular child who does not seem to be learning?)
3. Renewal Concerns - refers to the degree to which a student teacher is concerned with new knowledge and

---

[1]A copy of the Scale of Student Teaching Concerns may be obtained upon request from the authors.

skills available to enhance his/her effectiveness as a teacher (e.g., What are some of the new materials, techniques, approaches, and ideas about teaching? Who is developing a new approach to working with active children?)

4. Maturity Concerns - refers to the degree to which a student teacher is concerned with defining a personal philosophy of teaching (e.g., What is the nature of growth and learning? Can schools change societies?)

Scoring. Statements associated with each of the areas of teaching concerns are rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, from extremely important (5 points) to extremely unimportant (1 point). The ratings which students give each statement of teaching concerns are summed, yielding four separate scores for each subject, one score for each area of teaching concerns. Maximum scores for the different areas are Survival, 70 point, Consolidation and Renewal, 80 points each, and Maturity, 40 points. Higher proportional scores represent more concern for a particular area of teaching concerns.

Subjects. The subjects for this study consisted of 107 student teachers (10% males and 90% females) enrolled in seven teacher training programs at three universities and four community colleges with similar early childhood teacher training programs. The community colleges included Portland Community College (23%), Umpqua Community

College (8%), Chemeketa Community College (6%), and Mount Hood Community College (18%) all located in the Willamette Valley of Oregon. The universities were Montana State University (10%), Utah State University (14%), and Oregon State University (21%).

Of the 107 subjects, 53 students were at Teacher Training Level I (TTL I), and 54 were at Teacher Training Level II (TTL II). TTL I were in the beginning phase of their teacher training programs. Their training experiences included interaction with young children for no more than two academic quarters, covering less than ten hours a week. They fulfilled requirements involving the application of knowledge and observation skills in understanding children's behavior, interaction with young children in an organized educational setting, and supervision of children in planned activities as an assistant or an aide.

TTL II students were involved in the advanced phase of their training program. Their training experiences included extensive involvement with young children in a child development laboratory for at least three academic quarters, covering more than 10 hours a week. Aside from fulfilling all requirements of TTL I students, TTL II also fulfilled requirements in curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation; child guidance; parent education; self, staff and program evaluations. TTL II students also had the opportunity of assuming the role of a head teacher over a period of one week in a preschool program for approximately 15 children, where their teacher competencies

were observed and evaluated.

Content. The contents of the SSTC were developed by teacher trainees in early childhood education and by early childhood experts. Teacher trainees enrolled in the early childhood teacher training program at Oregon State University at various training levels generated the teaching concerns related to their teacher training experiences. Teacher trainees were asked to respond to a questionnaire asking them to write down as many questions or concerns they had about their teaching experiences, as they began their respective training practicums. In addition, teacher trainers were asked to identify other teaching concerns they were aware of that student teachers expressed during their training experiences. Furthermore, research on teacher training was explored for additional significant concerns.

Following identification of the teaching concerns, two early childhood experts and two student teachers were asked to classify the teaching concerns into the four areas previously identified by Katz (1972). The early childhood experts had earned advanced degrees in the field, and had considerable experiences in teaching preschool children, working with parents, supervising student teachers, and administering programs for young children. The students were trainees, one each at TTL I and TTL II, in the early childhood teacher training program at Oregon State University.

Prior to classifying the student teaching concerns, the early childhood experts and student teachers were given verbal and written

descriptions of each of the four areas of teaching concerns for use in their classification assignments. These classifications were first done independently, and then one week following these independent classifications a group meeting was held between the early childhood experts and student teachers. At the group meeting, the individual classifications were compared and when disagreements between them arose, resolution of them was made. All student teaching concerns classified, therefore, had to have a 100% agreement among the classifiers before their retention for possible inclusion in the final SSTC.

Once the teaching concerns were classified, a Likert-type scale was applied to each statement, asking individuals to respond to each statement from extremely important to extremely unimportant. Statements classified in each of the areas of teaching concerns were randomly varied throughout the SSTC to control for any response bias that might occur if they were sequentially ordered by areas of teaching concerns.

A final check of the SSTC, before administering it to the subjects was undertaken by submitting it for review to the early childhood experts and student teachers used in the generation of the concerns. In addition, a pilot study using three teacher trainees at TTL I and TTL II was undertaken. No major changes were made as a result of this check and pilot study.

Procedure. The SSTC was then administered to 107 teacher trainees at seven community colleges and universities with similar early childhood education teacher training programs. This was done during the

first week of the term at an orientation seminar, prior to involvement in their respective training practicums. Following this administration, several statistical measures were applied to the data to refine the instrument. First, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to estimate the relationship between each teaching concern previously classified within an area of teaching concerns. This was undertaken to identify 16 of the most highly correlated teaching concerns within each of the four areas of teaching concerns for possible inclusion in the final SSTC.

Second, following usch a teaching concern weed-out, the 16 most highly correlated teaching concers for each area of teaching concerns were together factor analyzed using a principal components solution and varimax rotation. From these analyses, it was expected that the teaching concerns which loaded on each of these factors in this analysis would be the same as those classified into these factors by the early childhood experts and student teachers earlier in the study.

Third, in order to obtain estimates of reliability for the final SSTC, item-total score correlation coefficients, using the Pearson product-moment method, were calculated for each of the statements included in each of the four areas of teaching concerns found in the final SSTC. In addition, internal consistency estimates for each of the four areas of teaching concerns were calculated using the Cronbach alpha statistic.

Fourth, to obtain an estimate of construct validity for the SSTC

the teaching concerns of TTL I and TTL II students were analyzed for significant differences. Since these four areas of teaching concerns would likely be correlated, a multivariate analysis of variance was applied to the data. Univariate tests, using the Wilks Lambda statistic, was then calculated to determine whether TTL I and TTL II students differed in their teaching concerns related to the areas of Survival, Consolidation, Renewal and Maturity.

Finally, an exploratory study focused on examining the relationship between students' teaching concerns and their teacher competencies was undertaken. After administration of the SSTC and three weeks following the student teachers' participation in their respective training practicums, teacher trainers were asked to rate their student teachers as to their competency as preschool teachers using the Preschool Teacher Competency Rating Scale (PTCRS). Directions for using the PTCRS have been specified in a previously publicized Examiner's Manual (Sugawara & Cramer, 1980). Scores of student teachers on the total PTCRS and its nine subscales were correlated with their scores on each of the SSTC scales. The Pearson product-moment correlation method was used in these analyses.

Results

In total, 167 statements representing teaching concerns were generated for the development of the SSTC.

Table 1 summarizes the mean correlation coefficients for the 16 most highly correlated concerns within each of the four areas of

teaching concerns. For Survival Concerns mean coefficients ranged from .33 to .47, for Consolidation Concerns .20 to .35, for the Renewal Concerns .31 to .43, and for the Maturity Concerns .24 to .57. It should be noted that separate correlation matricies were generated for both the community college and university samples. However, the results obtained were so similar that only the correlation coefficients of the total (combined) sample are presented here.

Insert Table 1 about here

Once the 16 most highly correlated teaching concerns within each of the four areas of teaching concerns were identified, all of these teaching concerns were factor analyzed using a principal components solution and varimax rotation (i.e., BMDP82 series). As a result of this factor analysis, four factors emerged including Survival (Factor 1), Consolidation (Factor 2), Renewal (Factor 3), and Maturity (Factor 4). The statements within each area of teaching concerns with loadings of .30 or above were retained for inclusion in the final SSTC. None of these concerns which loaded on a factor loaded on any other factor above .18. Therefore, the four factors which emerged were relatively independent factors. The Survival area resulted with 14 statements, the Consolidation and Renewal areas with 16 statements, and the Maturity area with 9 statements. Table 2 lists the teaching concerns related to each of the factors and their loadings for the total sample. Fur-

thermore, the teaching concerns which loaded onto the four different factors were the same as those previously classified into these factots by the early childhood experts and student teachers.

In order to further verify the existence of these four factors, a random sample of half of the subjects in this study were selected, and their responses on the same teaching concerns were factor analyzed. Results obtained verified the existence of the four factors as found in the total sample. Table 2 also summarizes the loadings of each teaching concern associated with the factors for this random half of the sample.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 3 presents the item-total score correlation coefficients for the teaching concerns found within each of the four areas of teaching concerns in the final SSTC. These coefficients ranged from .50 to .76 for Survival, .44 to .70 for Consolidation, .59 to .79 for Renewal, and .56 to .74 for Maturity. All of these coefficients are significant at the p .01 level.

Insert Table 3 about here

In addition, Cronbach alpha coefficients calculated for each of the four areas of teaching concerns in the final SSTC revealed coefficients of .90 for Survival, .88 for Consolidation, .92 for

Renewal, and .85 for Maturity. All of these coefficients are significant at the p .0001 level.

To obtain a construct validity estimate for the final SSTC, a one way multivariate analysis of variance (TTL I vs. TTL II students) was performed on subjects' responses related to all four areas of student teaching concerns including Survival, Consolidation, Renewal, and Maturity. The community college and university samples were not separated in this analysis since previous analyses revealed that the student teaching concerns of these two samples were very similar to each other. Furthermore, a multivariate analysis of variance was used due to moderate to high correlations (r = .64 to .83) between subject scores in each of the areas of teaching concerns. As a result of the present analysis, a significant difference, $F(1, 105) = 7.01$, p .0008 in their student teaching concerns. Univariate tests revealed significant differences between TTL I and TTL II students in all areas of teaching concerns, including Survival, $F(1, 105) = 46.99$, p .00001, Consolidation, $F(1, 105) = 49.25$, p .00001, Renewal, $F(1, 105) = 4.54$, p .03, and Maturity, $F(1, 105) = 19.26$, p .00001. Table 4 summarizes the means associated with these findings. In all of the areas of teaching concerns TTL I students had significantly higher concern scores than TTL II students.

Insert Table 4 about here

In order to obtain some information about the relationship between students' teaching concerns and their competency as preschool teachers, an exploratory study was undertaken in this area. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients estimating the relationship between subjects' scores on the SSTC and PTCRS were calculated, revealing no significant relationships between these two constructs. Table 5 summarizes the correlation coefficients obtained estimating the relationship between the four areas of teaching concerns assessed by the final SSTC and all of the teacher competency scale scores assessed by the PTCRS among TTL I and TTL II subjects.

Insert Table 5 about here

Discussion

The fact that teacher trainees generated many of the student teacher concerns in this study supports the notion that teacher trainees do have a variety of needs and concerns that can be expressed if they are asked to do so. Understanding and utilization of these concerns in designing teacher preparation programs can in part provide some of the significant information necessary for the creation of training programs relevant to student teacher needs (Fuller & Bown, 1975; Applegate & Lasley, 1983; Denton, 1983).

In the final SSTC, Survival Concerns were represented by 14 questions related to the most basic aspects of teaching in an early

childhood education program. They included questions about the number of children enrolled in the program, the frequency with which the the student teachers interacted with the children, the requirements of their training experiences, and the student teachers' position in the early childhood education program. On the other hand, Consolidation Concerns were represented by 16 questions associated with appropriate teacher behaviors in specific situations. They included questions about knowing how to deal with a troubled, non-English speaking or aggressive child. The Renewal Concerns were represented by 16 questions about newer and different resources, techniques and approaches that could be used in working with children and their parents. Finally, Maturity Concerns were represented by 9 questions related to the nature of growth and learning, ethical and philosophical basis of relating to children and underlying program philosophies.

Although the factor analysis revealed the emergence of four major areas (factors) of teaching concerns that were similar to Katz's theoretical ideas, multivariate analysis of the Survival, Consolidation, Renewal, and Maturity Concerns of subjects at two different teacher training levels (TTL I - beginning vs. TTL II - advanced) did not provide support for the developmental aspects of Katz's ideas. According to Katz, teachers in training start out with Survival Concerns, followed by Consolidation, Renewal and Maturity Concerns, respectively. On the basis of these theoretical ideas and the sample characteristics of the present study, we would have expected beginning level student teachers (TTL I) to have significantly higher Sur-

vival Concern scores than advanced level student teachers (TTL II), and advanced level student teachers to have significantly higher Maturity Concern Scores than beginning level student teachers. In addition, since the SSTC also taps concerns of student teachers in training between beginning and advanced levels, which were not part of the present sample, we would have expected results associated with Consolidation Concerns to be more similar to results associated with Survival than Maturity Concerns, and Renewal Concerns to be more similar to the results associated with Maturity than Survival Concerns, though not as significant. Instead, however, in the present study, beginning level student teachers had significantly higher Survival, Consolidation, Renewal and Maturity Concern scores than advanced level student teachers. Possibly, the time the SSTC was administered to the subjects in this study had something to do with these discrepant findings. In this study, the SSTC was administered to subjects prior to their enrollment in their respective training practicums. It was not unusual, therefore, that beginning level student teachers were found to have higher concern scores in all four areas of teaching concerns than advanced level student teachers, since the teacher training experience was more foreign and new to them than it was for the advanced level student teachers. Perhaps, administration of the SSTC after both beginning and advanced level student teachers had become a little more acclimated to their training practicums may have provided the developmental results expected on the basis of Katz's theoretical ideas.

On the other hand, the findings of the present study did suggest developmental data of a different sort. The present findings suggested that student teachers at the beginning and advanced levels all had concerns associated with the four areas of teaching concerns, only in different intensities. The concerns, while still important appeared to become less important as students moved to the advanced teacher training levels. Perhaps, the data does reflect what actually occurs in the process of teacher development. Rather than suggest that beginning level students have a predominance of Survival Concerns, and advanced level students have more Maturity Concerns, it may be more appropriate to indicate that trainees at all levels have concerns associated with all areas of teacher development, only in different intensities.

In addition to the construct validity estimate just described above, reliability estimates for the final SSTC were also obtained. Results revealed the final SSTC to be internally consistent within each of its scales (areas) of teaching concerns, indicating the items found within each of the scales (factors or areas) to be relatively homogenous.

Finally, results of the exploratory study relating subjects' teaching concerns to their teacher competency using the SSTC and PTCRS, respectively, revealed no significant relationships between them on all measurement scales and subscales. These results are suprising in light of previous research indicating the PTCRS to successfully discriminate between beginning and advanced level student

teachers in predicted directions, and Katz's developmental ideas about teaching concerns. On the basis of these facts and ideas, we would have expected the Survival, and perhaps, Consolidation scores of student teachers to be significantly and negatively related to their teacher competency scores, and the Maturity and perhaps, Renewal scores of these student teachers to be significantly and positively related to their teacher competency scores. However, as the present study revealed, no such significant relationships were found. Possibly, the time when the SSTC was administered to the subjects may have led to these discrepant findings. In the present study the SSTC was completed by student teachers prior to their involvement in their respective training practicums. The PTCRS, however, was used to assess the competency of student teachers during the third or fourth week of their training experiences. It is not unusual, therefore, that in this study, student teaching concerns were not found to be related to their teacher competency. If the SSTC and PTCRS were both administered at the same time, during the third or fourth week of the student's training experiences, then perhaps, the expected relationship between teaching concerns and teacher competency would have been obtained.

As a result of administering the SSTC to trainees, supervising teachers may use the information gained to tailor the training curricula based in part on student teacher needs. Since supervising teachers have the responsibility of setting the goals and objectives of the

training experience, being aware of trainee needs and concerns may strengthen the chances that such goals and objectives can be successfully met by all trainees. This can occur, since the SSTC may uncover previously hidden roadblocks to the learning process that trainees sometimes harbor within themselves. Meeting the needs and concerns of trainees, combined with achieving the goals and objectives of trainers for the student teaching experience, can provide the environment in which the teacher development process may be facilitated.

Table 1

Mean Correlation Coefficients for the 16 Most Highly Correlated Concerns Within Each of the Four Areas of Teaching Concerns

Survival		Consolidation		Renewal		Maturity	
Item No.	Mean Coeff.	Item No.	Mean Coeff.	Item No.	Mean Coeff.	Item No.	Mean Coeff.
24.	.43	20.	.28	41.	.32	50.	.32
29.	.33	30.	.30	59.	.36	55.	.31
34.	.39	31.	.28	62.	.31	61.	.28
38.	.39	44.	.27	74.	.35	68.	.36
46.	.37	53.	.20	78.	.37	73.	.30
57.	.37	69.	.34	84.	.31	76.	.34
64.	.39	77.	.30	90.	.39	80.	.30
81.	.35	97.	.31	92.	.34	104.	.33
82.	.33	100.	.31	106.	.36	119.	.34
98.	.37	110.	.28	107.	.43	129.	.24
105.	.34	111.	.31	116.	.35	133.	.32
113.	.41	126.	.30	118.	.35	141.	.28
114.	.45	134.	.20	121.	.38	142.	.36
147.	.47	136.	.35	127.	.36	148.	.57
152.	.45	164.	.31	131.	.32	161.	.30
159.	.42	167.	.26	132.	.35	162.	.33

Table 2
Student Teaching Concerns and their Factor Loadings
for the Total and Random Half-Sample

Factors and Questions	Loadings: Total Sample	Loadings: Random Half-Sample
FACTOR 1: SURVIVAL		
24. How many children will I be interacting with in the program?	.42	.53
29. What exactly will I be doing in my student teaching experience?	.61	.65
38. Will I be able to work with the children in the program?	.46	.79
46. How is the daily schedule organized?	.64	.79
57. How do I plan activities for the children?	.81	.79
64. Will there be enough time to fulfill all of the requirements for this teacher training experience?	.52	.79
81. How closely will I be observed during my teacher training experience?	.70	.66
82. Exactly how is a lesson plan written?	.73	.50
98. Will the children listen to the instructions I give to them?	.72	.77
105. What exactly can children at the ages I will be working with be expected to do?	.46	.84
114. Am I educated enough to undertake this student teaching experience?	.71	.64
147. Where can I obtain information concerning development?	.43	.78
152. Is it possible to spend to much time with one child in the program.	.48	.52
159. How do I hold a conversation with the parents?	.38	.85
FACTOR 2: CONSOLIDATION		
20. If a child pushes another child, what should I do?	.70	.69
30. What should I do when a child wants me to accompany him/her to an activity, but I'm busy with another activity?	.63	.44
31. Should I encourage a child to finish a project that s/he has started?	.39	.55
44. Why do some children cry when their parents leave them at school?	.35	.71
53. How can I communicate with a parent about their child, when the child has encountered many problems during the school day?	.72	.65
69. If a child starts to cry, what should I do?	.66	.54
77. How can I avoid favoritism when certain children are more appealing than others?	.76	.70
97. Will I be able to work with children whose first language is not English?	.38	.46
100. What should I say to a child who says that s/he doesn't want to be at school?	.65	.38
110. How should I handle challenging children?	.76	.61
111. How can I deal with my concern for the child's self concept?	.71	.86
126. How should I handle children's aggression toward other children?	.63	.87

Table 2 continued on next page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2, continued

Factors and Questions	Loadings: Total Sample	Loadings: Random Half-Sample
Factor 2: Consolidation, continued		
134. How can I actively become involved in research projects of the program?	.35	.42
136. When should I intervene in a conflict between two children?	.70	.76
164. Will I learn how to work with children having special needs?	.50	.71
164. Should a child with an illness, such as the common cold, be allowed to continue to participate in the program.	.57	.78
FACTOR 3: RENEWAL		
41. How do different programs organize their parent meetings.	.58	.53
48. What can be done to accomplish the program objectives in new and different ways?	.48	.48
59. What are the different early childhood education models available?	.73	.66
62. How do different programs incorporate various theories of development into their curriculum?	.60	.44
74. Where and how often are early childhood conferences held?	.68	.30
78. Will I be reading articles taken from a variety of early childhood education jorunals?	.66	.78
84. How can I design a research project?	.72	.78
90. Will there be an opportunity for me to observe other programs?	.74	.55
92. Are there science experiments appropriate for children 1 to 3 years of age?	.64	.73
106. Are field trips appropriate for the children I'll be working with?	.61	.82
107. Will I be able to participate in early childhood education conferences?	.72	.88
116. Where do I obtain information about what other programs are like?	.76	.34
118. What is the difference between our program and other early childhood education programs?	.74	.37
121. Will I be relating class lecture information to my learning experiences in the teacher training program?	.59	.50
127. How can I apply the information I read from research to my student teaching experience?	.65	.54
132. What are the names of some of the journals in the field of early childhood eduacation?	.73	.84
FACTOR 4: MATURITY		
50. What aspects of the teacher training experience will be useful in my interaction with others?	.68	.38
55. How is this student teaching experience going to help me?	.83	.79

Table 2 continued on next page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2, continued

Factors and Questions	Loadings: Total Sample	Loadings: Random Half-Sample
Factor 4: Maturity, continued		
61. Is there an ethical or philosophical basis upon which to disallow a child from participating in a program?	.36	.48
68. What is the nature of growth and learning among children?	.74	.80
76. How can I adapt from one teaching philosophy to another?	.40	.79
80. What is the underlying philosophy of this program?	.34	.68
148. What is the difference between a family-centered and child-centered early childhood program?	.45	.37
161. How can I use positive statements while interacting with children throughout the while day?	.58	.42
162. What are the rights of children in any research project.	.43	.79

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
Item-Total Score Correlation Coefficients for the Teaching Concerns found Within Each of the Areas of Teaching Concerns in the Final SSTC

Survival		Consolidation		Renewal		Maturity	
Item No.	Coeff.	Item No.	Coeff.	Item No.	Coeff.	Item No.	Coeff.
24.	.67	20.	.60	41.	.60	50.	.72
29.	.56	30.	.65	59.	.69	55.	.69
38.	.63	31.	.57	62.	.61	61.	.56
46.	.66	44.	.57	74.	.66	68.	.74
57.	.50	53.	.44	78.	.74	76.	.69
64.	.71	69.	.68	84.	.66	80.	.61
81.	.66	77.	.62	90.	.76	142.	.70
82.	.66	97.	.63	92.	.61	161.	.64
98.	.67	100.	.65	106.	.60	162.	.70
105.	.70	110.	.59	107.	.79		
114.	.72	111.	.65	116.	.72		
147.	.76	126.	.64	118.	.66		
152.	.66	134.	.44	121.	.68		
159.	.67	136.	.70	127.	.68		
		164.	.62	131.	.59		
		167.	.62	132.	.73		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4
Means of Total Factor Scores, Proportional Scores, Standard Deviations and F-Ratios for the Teaching Concerns Scores of Subjects Related to Each of the Areas of Teaching Concerns by Teacher Training Level

Area of Concern/Training Level	Mean	Proportional Score	Standard Deviation	F-ratios
Survival:				
TTL I	59.20	83.0	5.79	46.99****
TTL II	49.23	73.4	8.98	
Consolidation:				
TTL I	65.85	82.3	6.21	49.25****
TTL II	56.03	70.0	8.16	
Renewal:				
TTL I	58.92	73.6	11.22	4.54**
TTL II	54.43	68.0	9.98	
Maturity:				
TTL I	36.70	74.1	4.69	19.26****
TTL II	32.28	70.1	5.69	

****p .00001
**p .03

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5
Correlation Coefficients Expressing the Relationship Between Areas of Teaching Concerns and Teacher Competency

Teacher Competency	Areas of Teaching Concerns											
	Survival			Consolidation			Renewal			Maturity		
	TTLI	TTLII	TOTAL	TTLI	TTLII	TOTAL	TTLI	TTLII	TOTAL	TTLI	TTLII	TOTAL
Understanding Behavior	.01	.01	.02	.01	-.11	.00	.01	.01	.00	.01	-.13	.02
Guidance	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.02	.01	.01	.02	.12	-.10	.00
Relationships												
Children	.01	.01	.01	.00	.02	.06	.01	.10	.06	.01	.01	.01
Program	-.15	.02	.02	.01	-.12	.00	-.11	.01	.03	.01	-.14	.00
Staff	-.18	.01	-.11	-.12	.01	.09	.01	.01	.03	.01	.01	.05
Parents	.01	-.10	.02	.21	-.11	.01	.11	-.13	.03	.12	-.20	.01
Evaluation												
Program	.01	-.19	.02	.01	.01	.01	.01	-.13	.00	.01	-.22	.01
Self	.01	-.15	.07	-.19	-.10	.05	.01	-.14	.09	.01	-.27	09
Staff	.01	.01	-.12	.01	.01	.08	.01	.01	.01	.01	-.12	.09
Total PTCRS	.01	.03	.03	.01	.01	.02	.01	.01	.07	.01	-.12	.02

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Applegate, J. and Lasley, T. (1983). What undergraduate students expect from pre field experiences. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 473).

Burden, P.J. (1980). Teachers' perceptions of the characteristics and influences on their personal and professional development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198 087).

Denton, J.J. (1983). Do early field experiences in teacher education provide a meaningful context for acquiring pedagogical knowledge? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 234 038).

Elliot, P. and Steinkellner, L. (1979). Weakness in inservice and preservice teacher training. The Clearing House, 52, 421-423.

Fuller, F. and Bown, F. (1975). Becoming a teacher in Ryan (Ed.) Teacher Education, the 1974 yearbook of the national society for the study of education, pt. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Greener, J. and Thurlow, M. (1982). Teacher opinions about professional education teacher programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 043).

Help! teachers can't teach. (June 16, 1980). Time.

Katz, L. (1972) Developmental stages of preschool teachers. The Elementary School Journal, 23, (1), 50-54.

Lyons, F. (1980). Why teachers can't teach. Phi Delta Kappan.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: the imperative for education reform.

Queen, J.A. and Gretes, J.A. (1982). First year teachers' perceptions

of their preservice training. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 215-216.

Ryan, L., Applegate, J., Flora, R., Johnston, J., Lasley, T., Mager, G. and Newman, K. (1979). "My teacher education program? well..." first year teachers reflect and react. Peabody Journal of Education, 267-271.

Sugawara, A. & Cramer, M. (1980) A preschool teacher competency rating scale. Home Economics Research Journal, 8 (6), 405-411.

Teachers are in trouble. (April 27, 1981). Newsweek.

Watts, H. (1980). Starting out, moving on, running ahead, or how the teachers' center can attend to stages in teacher development. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 200 604).